



## **Iowa Smart Planning Meeting Notes Aug. 11, 2010**

### **I. Introductions**

- a. Task Force members in attendance: Les Beck, Darrell Hanson (for Rob Berntsen), Charles Connerly, Stuart Crine, Bill Ehm, Bruce Greiner, Heather Hackbarth, Rick Hunsaker, Jessica Hyland Harder, Senator Pam Jochum (phone) Chad Kuene, Bob Mulqueen (for Bret Mills) Ruth Randleman (Co-Chair), Nancy Richardson (Co-Chair), Representative Tom Schueller, Carey Nagle, Donald Temeyer, David Wilwerding
- b. Task Force members not in attendance: LaDene Bowen, Teri Goodmann, Emily Shields, Senator Shawn Hamerlink, David Johnston, Jeff Kolb, Paula Mohr, Joe Mowers, Pam Myhre, Wayne Petersen, Machel Shaffer, Ken Sharp, Dan Smith, Gary Taylor, Representative Nick Wagner
- c. Others in attendance: Jenna Anderson, Stuart Anderson, Adam Bartelt, Bill Freeland, LaVon Griffieon, Susan Judkins Josten, Theresa Kehoe, Annette Mansheim, Mary Beth Mellick, Jace Mikels, Tony Phillips, Dennis Plautz, Marcia Tannian, Aaron Todd, Liz Van Zomeren, Nichole Warren

### **II. Approval of meeting minutes. No discussion. Unanimous approval.**

### **III. Committee and Workgroup Updates**

- a. Intergovernmental Coordination and Information Sharing Committee
  - i. Annette Mansheim (more information found on a PowerPoint presentation – visit the Iowa Smart Planning Web page) – for Emily Hajek, Chair of Workgroup A: Integration of Smart Planning Principles
    - 1. The integration workgroup has held one meeting.
    - 2. Discussed pilot survey of state agencies. Survey responses are due Aug. 16 for workgroup review. Workgroup meets Sept. 9 to discuss survey results, analyze and determine how best to proceed.
    - 3. Questions and Answers
      - a. Q: OEI establishing an energy code and having one in place is a big benefit to Iowa. Through the Power Fund, grants available for energy use/consumption planning in communities. Has issued 50-75 grants. This could be a part of this. Energy code could have a huge economic impact. We think about roads/sewer/water, but have people thought about IUB?
      - b. A: that is a great resource to be aware of.
  - ii. Don Temeyer – Chair of Workgroup B: Information Sharing and Coordination
    - 1. Provided written update (see attached) from the committee's last two meetings. Thanked staff assistance and coordination efforts of Aaron Todd, Susan Judkins Josten and Heather Hackbarth. Invited others to attend task force meetings.
    - 2. Current flooding in Ames shows the need to think differently.
    - 3. Information for planning needs to be free and accessible to everyone, so it is important to identify a permanent repository. Certain parts of this are already available. The question is, how can this be established at the state level without reinventing the wheel or creating a new organization for it?

4. Work group discussed Wisconsin's laws and structure which doesn't make communities follow a state-down approach. It establishes guides rather than mandates. Some other states are top-driven, other states are bottom-driven. The committee has not been able to talk to the flood center of Iowa yet, but it will be important to do so.
5. Another question the workgroup is considering is, where should repository and geographic information be located in the state of Iowa? Iowa used to have a state-level planning department, but most of that is now housed in IDED. The committee is open to task force suggestions. Aug. 25 is the deadline for recommendations.
6. Questions and Answers
  - a. Q: Have you discussed the degree to which planning is mandatory/voluntary in the state?  
A: No. That is a discussion to be had on the 25th. It will likely follow the Wisconsin model – not mandatory, but at the community level (bottom-driven).
  - b. Q: What drove Wisconsin communities to adopt plans?  
A: Wisconsin incented plans and regional collaboration with funds.
  - c. Q: Compared to a lot of states, Iowa has a lot of cities and counties per capita. Has the group talked about using metropolitan planning agency or regional planning affiliation plans rather than individual jurisdictions? This would help get it down to a more manageable level. That's the network most important to the DOT, so it is natural to think in that way for some. Also, since many issues cross jurisdictional lines, this would be an effective approach.  
A: We have discussed that, especially the IDOT model. It works well because people/communities have something to gain from that. Something like that could be an incentive to get everyone (state/local/regional) to the table. Bottom-up, based on state principles.

b. Comprehensive Planning Committee

- i. Les Beck/Rick Hunsaker (more information found on their PowerPoint presentation – visit the Iowa Smart Planning Web page) – Chairs of Workgroup C (Local Comprehensive Planning) and Workgroup D (Regional Comprehensive Planning)
  1. Two workgroups (D and C). This afternoon, these workgroups will hold their fourth meeting.
  2. Workgroup C's task is to develop statewide goals to implement principles and measure progress toward achieving goals (other goals listed on PowerPoint presentation)
  3. One challenge was understanding what the legislature meant by "develop goals" – principles are already written as goals. Workgroup is "drilling down" to develop more specific policy recommendations to help achieve goals.
  4. Progress: Put together draft framework to measure progress toward achieving goals.
  5. Sampling underway of communities and their plans.
  6. Questions and Answers
    - a. Q: Mandatory, top-down? Bottom-up?

A: If you want to see changes in land-use patterns, it has to be mandatory. If you want to see education, make it optional. We don't see it being mandatory. Possibly rely on disincentives – if you don't do this, you cannot access a certain source of funding.

- b. Q: Next step is implementation – we can incentivize this. In your experience, cities/counties that do have a plan, do they implement them well? Do they sit on a shelf?

A: Mixed bag. One thought is to require reporting to evaluate progress in order to receive incentives. Need to provide some sort of ongoing source of funding. Community Building Plan at IDED was successful until the state stopped requiring it, then it dropped off.

- c. Q: We should look at incentives for regional collaboration. A small, rural community's plan wouldn't do much unless it was part of a regional approach. Economy of scale.

- d. A: This approach implies some willingness of communities to abide by the plan.

#### IV. Discussion of Public Input Process

a. Nancy Richardson

- i. Two committees each with two workgroups will bubble-up recommendations based on discussion. The task force will decide what recommendations will go to a report for the governor based on task force work. Want to get as much public input as we can, but this will be difficult in such a short amount of time. Task force will discuss current thoughts and other ways.
- ii. Between Sept. 28 and Oct. 7, the Task Force will hold six public input sessions (one by webinar), the others located across the state. Five or six Task Force members will staff each event and help promote these events/enticing people to attend. At events, someone should be a "point person" for each event to manage it. Also, conversation should take place with taskforce chairs to ensure conversation is established before events.
- iii. At public input meetings, talk about draft recommendations and receive feedback. Task force will consider this while developing final recommendations.
- iv. In concert with this, develop a qualitative and quantitative survey on the recommendations. Have them at the meetings and allow them to be turned in. Have these submitted by Oct. 10. Also envision having this survey available on a Web site for wider distribution.
- v. Task Force does not have a budget, but some resources may be available from some of the larger agencies. The Task Force may rely on COGs to find good locations for low/no price.
- vi. We need to target invitees to ensure the right people are there.
- vii. Want to make sure to solicit comments/facilitate discussion.
- viii. Thought is to provide a formal review of "what is the task force/smart planning/etc," then break into informal small groups for people to discuss. This might help encourage participation.
- ix. This would be the beginning, not the end. Since the report will be vetted further, this is not the final opportunity for input. Also, the Task Force can use this as an opportunity to see what we have not thought of/what we may have missed.
- x. How many people will attend? Unknown. In our experience (with WRCC), attendance varies greatly. Timing is everything – we'll be coming out with this at a time when it is on everyone's minds (due to recent flooding).

- xi. This could help us build a constituency if we use this as an educational opportunity. If we can sell these concepts, we can build support across the state.
- xii. This topic could result in high emotion – if we discuss the benefits and stay away from talk about bureaucracy, we will be more successful.
- xiii. League of cities can send out info to listserv to solicit surveys from individual cities. RIO can draft press release which other agencies can use and RIO can contact media.
- xiv. If we use local papers, make sure they get the info a week to a week in a half before the event. Also, utilize local contacts to send that along to the papers rather than a statewide agencies so that papers know it's applicable to them.
- xv. By next meeting, we will have begun work on sites/locations for events.

V. Other issues

- a. Next task force meeting Sept. 15, Oct. 20
- b. Thanks to workgroup chairs and staff

VI. Adjourn